



June 7, 2001

Mr. John Steiner
Division Chief
City of Austin - Law Department
P.O. Box 1546
Austin, Texas 78767-1546

OR2001-2378

Dear Mr. Steiner:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 148121.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for information related to several categories of information. You state that you will release all responsive information to the requestor with the exception of the first requested item, which is "any memos, letters, e-mails, or other written communication to, from, or within the Austin Police Department (or its employees) concerning the recently proposed 'Sidewalk Ordinance' that is to be heard by City Council in April." You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.106, 552.10, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered your claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. In instances where an attorney represents a governmental entity, the attorney-client privilege protects only an attorney's legal advice and the client's confidences made to the attorney. *See* Open Records Decision No. 574 (1990). Accordingly, these two classes of information are the only information contained in the records at issue that may be withheld pursuant to the attorney-client privilege. In Open Records Decision No. 574 (1990), this office concluded that section 552.107 excepts from public disclosure only "privileged information," that is, information that reflects either confidential communications from the client to the attorney or the attorney's legal advice or opinions; it does not apply to all client information held by a governmental body's attorney. Open

Records Decision No. 574 at 5 (1990). Section 552.107(1) does not except purely factual information from disclosure. *Id.* Section 552.107(1) does not except from disclosure factual recounting of events or the documentation of calls made, meetings attended, and memos sent. *Id.* at 5. After review of the submitted e-mails and their attachments, we agree that these documents are attorney-client communications and therefore excepted from disclosure under section 552.107(1).

Section 552.106 excepts from disclosure “[a] draft or working paper involved in the preparation of proposed legislation” and “[a]n internal bill analysis or working paper prepared by the governor’s office for the purpose of evaluating proposed legislation.” Section 552.106 ordinarily applies only to persons with a responsibility to prepare information and proposals for a legislative body. Open Records Decision No. 460 (1987). The purpose of section 552.106 is to encourage frank discussion on policy matters between the subordinates or advisors of a legislative body and the members of the legislative body, and therefore, it does not except from disclosure purely factual information. *Id.* at 2. However, a comparison or analysis of factual information prepared to support proposed legislation is within the ambit of section 552.106. *Id.* A proposed budget constitutes a recommendation by its very nature and may be withheld under section 552.106. *Id.* This office has also concluded that the drafts of municipal ordinances and resolutions which reflect policy judgments, recommendations, and proposals are excepted by section 552.106. Open Records Decision No. 248 (1980). We agree that the submitted draft ordinance is excepted from disclosure based on this exception.

Because sections 552.106 and 552.107 are dispositive, we do not address your additional arguments. This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records;

2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the General Services Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Kay H. Hastings
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KHH/DKB/seg

Ref: ID# 148121

Encl. Submitted documents

cc: Mr. T.J. Vineyard
300 East Riverside #112
Austin, Texas 78704
(w/o enclosures)